

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/088,598	03/21/2002	Akio Yamane	2002-0401A 6872		
513 7	7590 05/22/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
	TH, LIND & PONACK	SALMON, KATHERINE D			
2033 K STREI SUITE 800	ET N. W.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021			1634		
			DATE MAILED: 05/22/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/088,598	YAMANE, AKIO		
Examiner	Art Unit	_	
Katherine Salmon	1634		

	Katherine Salmon	1634						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 10 May 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notal Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliantime periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in (	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)					
a) $\square$ The period for reply expires $\underline{5}$ months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or  TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final reject E FIRST REPLY WAS F	ion. FILED WITHIN					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exampler 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	ctension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig or than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Off	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as					
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comfiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	ns of the date of ne appeal. Since					
	but prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered b	000000					
	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below):							
<ul><li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or</li></ul>	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.		ected claims.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s			,					
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>								
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>NONE</u> .		ll be entered and an	explanation of					
Claim(s) objected to: <u>NONE</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3 and 5-10</u> . Claim(s) with drawn from consideration: NONE								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>NONE</u> . <u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	ut before or on the date of filing a N nd sufficient reasons why the affida	otice of Appeal will <u>n</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attac	hed.					
11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered b  See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).  13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	JEANINE A. G	Yoldhug OLDBERG					
		PRIMARY E						
		5/18						

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendment after final rejection filed on 05/10/2006 has not been entered. Claims 9 and 11-16 are newly presented and have not been previously searched. The method for detecting a nucleic acid did not previously require the newly added limitations.

Continuation of 11. does not place the application in condition for allowance because: The response traverses the 102 and 103 rejections in the reply filed 5/10/2006. Applicant asserts that Livak et al. fail to teach a method in which there is no quenching of the labeling substance. In view of the arguments this is found persuasive, the 102 and 103 rejections have been withdrawn because the method taught by Livak et al. would not meet the limitations of "not quenching" as argued by response the probe with 0 to 1 nucleotides. The response traverses the 112 enablement rejection in the reply filed 5/10/2006. Applicant asserts there is support for a probe having the labeling substance position on the nucleic acid 0 to 1 nucleotides apart from the energy-absorbing substance (p. 8). Applicant asserts the invention is supported by No. 14, 17, 21, and 24 in Table 1 on p. 13 (p. 9). The response is not persuasive, Table 1 also teaches probes having a labeling substance position on the nucleic acid 0 to 1 nucleotides apart from the energy absorbing substance in which fluorescent intensity is keep at control levels (quenching occurs), see No. 15, 18, 20, and 23 on Table 1 (p. 13 and 14 of instant specification). It is unpredictable which probes having a labeling substance position on the nucleic acid 0 to 1 would not quench and which ones would based on the specification teachings.

Katherine Salmon 5/18/2006

Katherine Salmon

Examiner

Art Unit 1634

JEANINE A. GOLDBERG PRIMARY EXAMINER

5/18/06